

Date:	02.11.09	
Chair:	M Atkinson, NIE	
Attendees:	<i>RMDS</i> – Conor Garrigan <i>Consumer Council</i> – Richard Williams <i>ESB Customer Supply</i> - Gerry McDonald <i>ESB ICT</i> – Tom Ryan, Colette McEvoy, Joseph Murphy <i>NIE Energy</i> – Clifford Morrison <i>Firmus Energy</i> – Veronika Gallagher, Mary O’Kane <i>ESB Networks</i> – Walter Keady, Theresa O’Neill	<i>BG Energy</i> – Ger Harnett, Mark Speers <i>NIAUR</i> – Michael Campbell <i>Gemserv</i> – Malcolm Rowley <i>NIE</i> – Helen Mounsey, Shane O’Neill, Ann Ferguson, Nigel Wray <i>Airtricity</i> – Siobhan Leane, Karen Cahill <i>Energia</i> – Mandy Reid, Natasha McGee, Thomas Heasley <i>ESB IE</i> – Robert O’Brien
Apologies:		
Version Number		
Change Made		

Slides of the meeting are issued separately

Agenda:		
1.	Matters arising from HWG 20 October	Michael Atkinson, NIE
2.	Minutes from HWG 20 October	Michael Atkinson, NIE
3.	Presentation of Fieldwork Proposals and Issues	Ann Ferguson, NIE

4.	Clarification of Comments on HWG 20 October	Ann Ferguson, NIE
5.	AOB	Michael Atkinson, NIE
6.	Update on Harmonisation Project Governance Arrangements	Michael Atkinson, NIE

1. Matters Arising from HWG 20 October

	<p>M Atkinson addressed matters arising from the previous HWG.</p> <p>Slide 3: Message spreadsheets to include an indicator to identify numeric fields – Will provide key details on validation</p> <p>NIE to provide presentation and message data two working days before HWG</p> <p>EU Third Package, CoS processes – intention to align where possible, guidance requested from CER/NIAUR</p> <p>NIE MRPN Website data publication</p> <p>M Campbell stated that NIAUR might be constrained by the DPA, and legal advice needs to be taken.</p> <p>Slides as presented.</p>
--	--

2. Minutes from HWG 20 October

	<p>M Atkinson asked whether participants had issues to raise on the minutes from the previous HWG. T. O'Neill stated that she had requested RMDS to make some revisions to these minutes.</p>
--	---

3. Presentation of Fieldwork Proposals and Issues - General Issues

	<p>A Ferguson presented the Fieldwork Proposals and Issues, beginning with General Issues.</p> <p>Slide 4: Fieldwork – Appointment Booking</p> <p>ESB MP Extranet Website – supplier can identify available appointment slots, no appointment ID</p>
--	--

3. Presentation of Fieldwork Proposals and Issues - General Issues

NIE Website – supplier can book an appointment, ID entered on message, date and time can be used to indicate preferred time where appointment cannot be booked.

Slides as presented.

Slide 5: Fieldwork – Messaging Introduction

NIE to introduce messages 017, 030, 252, 260, replacing MM 131

NIE to introduce response MMs 106D/E, 117R/D, 130R/D, 137R, 352R

MM 131 replaced for most purposes with a new version consistent with proposed 131 MM in MCR0171 (ESB)

Slides as presented.

Slide 6: Fieldwork – Messaging Fields General

NIE to carry market participant business messages through to response messages

Review of code list contents to harmonise – works type, observation codes, reason codes

Change of tenancy allowed on MMs 017, 010, 016; 017 only MM to include customer name, contact address, notification address, technical contact – all new request messages include party contact segment

Slides as presented.

Slide 7: Party Contact

Only change required in Rol – email field length increased to 70 characters

Slides as presented.

Slide 8: Meter Point Status Change

MP status change using message 017

3. Presentation of Fieldwork Proposals and Issues - General Issues

MM 017 can be used to advise CoT/CoLE – required date refers to CoT date, not fieldwork date – change of use only notified on 016

K Cahill enquired whether there was to be mandatory MPBRN notification. A Ferguson replied that it is optional for 017, but that it would be notified on a supplier request. K Cahill then asked whether the schema would include 117D MM, and A Ferguson stated that it would. It was added that there may be a delay to an appointment, but that would follow receipt of the fieldwork. S Leane asked if that meant that someone would always be available to call out. A Ferguson replied that the call would be rescheduled via a 131 MM if there was no-one available.

Slide 9: Meter Point Status Change – Process Differences

Restrictions on domestic de-energisation in NI

M Campbell stated the need for an existing de-energisation process. C Morrison responded that there is a keypad option for domestic customers, but that it is not always suitable, and the de-energisation option is required.

De-energisation suspends capacity and standing charges in NI

Keypad tariff configuration can be changed on energisation

Customer name is required in NI for HV sites, not on 017 MM.

K Cahill asked whether there is validation on names in NI, and A Ferguson said there is not. K Cahill enquired why the customer name would then be needed. A Ferguson responded that customer names are stored, and J Murphy added that ESB allows change of legal entity on a 017 MM.

Slide 10: Message 017 Change of Meter Point Status Request

Adding fields to RoI MM, tariff configuration code and appointment ID

K Cahill asked whether the ESB will take a different name and a Y in the CoLE flag to mean a change of legal entity. J Murphy replied that it will and this is no change to the current process. K Cahill enquired whether there is a separate CoLE message for RoI but none for NI. A Ferguson responded that there will be a common 017 MM. K Cahill further asked whether a

3. Presentation of Fieldwork Proposals and Issues - General Issues

CoLE flag and different name is taken to be change of tenancy. A Ferguson answered in the affirmative.

Slide 11: Message 117R Rejection of Request

Remains as is.

Slides as presented.

Slide 12: Message 137R Rejection of Appointment

Message 137R in Rol used for variety of reasons – no change

NI use restricted to failure to provide fieldwork request message after online booking

S Leane asked whether the appointment request should not just time out. A Ferguson replied that notice of cancellation had been requested by suppliers.

Applies to – change of meter point status, meter works, special read request in NI only

Slide 13: Message 137R Appointment Rejected

Slides as presented.

Slide 14: Message 117D Fieldwork Delayed

K Cahill asked how special reads will be handled. A Ferguson responded that a special read will need an appointment, and will follow the same process as a meter change or energisation request. S Leane enquired as to what rejection message would be used in NI, and A Ferguson replied that it is the 352R with a required date. A participant asked whether a 261 will be received in response to a 260, and A Ferguson replied in the affirmative.

Slide 15: 106D Interval Meter Point De-energised

Same as in Rol, comments field included.

A Ferguson asked whether the comments field is used in NI, and J Murphy replied in the negative, stating that it is applicable to NI only.

3. Presentation of Fieldwork Proposals and Issues - General Issues**Slide 16: Message 106E Interval Meter Point Energised**

Comments field – removing from schema

Slides as presented.

Slide 17: Meter Works

Meter works requested using message 030

Responses using 130R, 137R, 130D, 131, 331, 332

Message 030 cannot be used to advise CoT/CoLE

Updated set of meter works types to be agreed, reflecting arrangements in NI/Rol

Slides as presented.

Slide 18: Meter Works – Processing Differences

Differences between keypad and token metering

Validation of customer name in NI for HV site – NIE propose to imply change of usage type from MM 030

NIE propose to imply energisation required when receiving MM 030 requiring change of metering configuration

Slides as presented.

Slide 19: Message 030 Meter Works Request

Slides as presented.

Slide 20: Message 130R Rejection of Request

Slides as presented.

3. Presentation of Fieldwork Proposals and Issues - General Issues**Slide 21: Message 130D Meter Works Delayed**

Slides as presented.

Slide 22: Special Reads

Special reads requested using MM 252

Responses using 352R, 137R NI only, 131, 300S

Slides as presented.

Slide 23: Message 252 Special Read Request

Slides as presented.

Slide 24: Message 352R Special Read Request Rejection

Slides as presented.

Slide 25: Meter Problems and Damage

Meter problems/damage reported by supplier using 260, response report using 261

Meter problems/damage raised through 260 may also lead to replacements using MMs 331, 332

S Leane asked whether a 261 is always sent to suppliers in Rol. J Murphy replied that a number of meter problem/damage codes go straight to a service order without triggering a 261 MM. S Leane enquired whether this is covered in the MCR 0171 (new 131 MM). J Murphy stated that a finished call results in a 131 MM. S Leane asked whether a MPBRN would match what was originally sent in the 260. J Murphy replied that the 260 is linked to the 261, with a standalone replacement order with a 331/2 MM. K Cahill pointed out that work flows might be marked as complete because they have timed out, and that a rule should be in place to allow for follow-up with customers. J Murphy said that the intention of the new 131 MM is to indicate that the work is finished. A participant asked whether NI will adopt the same principle, and J Murphy referred to proposed MM 131. S Leane enquired as to whether suppliers should raise a Discussion Request to cover a response, J Murphy replied that it should be done through the IGG.

3. Presentation of Fieldwork Proposals and Issues - General Issues**Slide 26: Meter Problems and Damage – Differences**

NIE do not propose to introduce distribution company detected problems/damage reporting using MM 311

Slide as presented.

Slide 27: Message 260 Observation of Problem/Damage or Tampering**Slide 28: Message 261 Resolution of problem or damage**

Slides as presented.

Slide 29: Message 311 Meter Problem Notification

Slide as presented.

Slide 30: Message 131 Fieldwork Status

Message 131 implementation will be broadly consistent with MCR171 in RoI

Will advise on cancellation, rescheduling, completion, non-completion of fieldwork

Slide as presented.

Slide 31: Message 131 Fieldwork Status Code

S Leane asked whether there will be a cut-off time. A Ferguson replied that it is a design issue, but that it will probably be the day before.

Slide 32: Message 131 Usage Matrix

S Leane pointed out that the table should be put into the message implementation guides.

Slide 33: Message 131

Slide as presented.

3. Presentation of Fieldwork Proposals and Issues - General Issues**Slide 34: Message 131 – Process Differences**

Status S applies in NI only

Duplicate request

A participant enquired whether the same appointment ID can be used before an appointment date, and S O'Neill replied that a rescheduled appointment would keep the same ID. A Ferguson added that a cancellation would require a new appointment ID. S Leane asked whether fieldwork would have to be sent through again. A Ferguson responded that any status 'S' requires a rescheduling, and J Murphy added that the code will indicate the reason. K Cahill asked whether C1 and C2 require new appointment IDs, and A Ferguson explained that both would close the call.

NIE also propose to use MM 131 for special read request

Slide 35: Clarifications from HWG 2

Comments received on – message header/alternative supplier ID; MPRN website; CoS estimate; required dates and cooling-off period; objection and cancellation; new connection; re-registration; miscellaneous items

Slide as presented.

Slide 36: Message Header

Alternative supplier removed from message header – NIE will no longer create MMs on behalf of suppliers

Not intended to prevent suppliers from creating MMs on behalf of other suppliers

K Cahill indicated that two MPCCs are needed in RoI, and that suppliers either have to set up another MPCC or manually register customers when taking over another supplier. A Ferguson said that this is being raised as an issue with the technical work stream.

3. Presentation of Fieldwork Proposals and Issues - General Issues**Slide 37: MPRN Website Clarifications**

NIE proposals for downloads – single MPRN download from search, bulk download with data for all domestic meter points.

K Cahill stated that domestic data is currently available in CD format in RoI. T O'Neill clarified that it is not a part of market procedures to provide this data on CD on an ongoing basis and that this was the reason behind DR 172.

Domestic bulk downloads being considered in RoI under DR172; NIAUR requested to provide guidance on provision of sensitive customer data in NI

Load profile, meter and timeslot data to be available in RoI and NI

Suppliers requested visibility of MMs sent and received by NIE

S Leane noted that messages sent through MPCCs are visible, but MMs are not, and also asked whether NIAUR have been asked to give direction on bulk download. M Campbell explained that additional legal advice is being taken to determine what can be published in order to develop the joint schema, and feedback will be provided next week. G Harnett enquired whether a timescale on the legal advice was available and M Campbell replied that it was not at that stage.

Slide 38: CoS Estimates

Two suppliers have supported use of estimates to complete a CoS – Two have raised concerns due to risk of increased levels of CoS reading disputes

ESB will provide data on current numbers of CoS estimates and disputes

C McEvoy gave figures of 357,856 CoS completing in RoI between 1 January and 28 October, of which 32% were estimated CoSs, 10% of which resulted in present less than previous readings and 1% of which were disputed by a 208 message and some of these would be included in the figure for present less than previous. M Atkinson asked what the picture was given by the statistics, and A Ferguson replied that disputes were not much of a problem. K Cahill added that estimates in RoI had improved, and it should be the same for NI. A Ferguson stated that the NI target was 99.5% read within a year.

No reading in the last 12 months – access arrangement in both NI and RoI

3. Presentation of Fieldwork Proposals and Issues - General Issues

C Morrison indicated that the CoS estimate might be highly inaccurate if a meter reading had not been obtained for 2-3 years, and that the notion of a difficult to read meter acted as an opt-out in this sense. A Ferguson replied that NIE will be looking at its hard to read policy. C Morrison added that the new supplier should discuss with the customer how the meter should be read. K Cahill countered that this is protective of the old supplier. C Morrison stated that the customer is usually the factor in preventing a read, and the best leverage for getting a read has to be looked at. A participant raised location difficulties in a factor, and that this raised a range of difficulties for the new supplier. K Cahill pointed out that multiple rollovers could not be proven without a read history, and there is no real evidence that the debt is significant in any case. C Morrison responded that most commercial and industrial customers should have arrangements where meters are hard to read.

K Cahill said that Networks can replace hard to read meters with smart meters, but C Morrison indicated that the infrastructure was not in place in NI or RoI, and that NHH meters are not cost-effective for small suppliers. A Ferguson stated that there is a commitment to write the hard to read policy by year end. C Morrison stated that there is no direction connection agreement between the distribution business and the customer, so the supplier has to take responsibility. G Harnett asked whether the 99% target applied to all meter points or to domestic and non domestic individually. A Ferguson responded that it may not include large customers.

A participant said that the volumes of present less than previous readings were significant. K Cahill stated that it meant the previous 310 MM is withdrawn, and does not cover CoS, and asked whether that meant the final bill is reversed. G Harnett stated that the present less than previous probably made it more accurate. A Ferguson added that the timeframe could be reviewed if 12 months is too long.

Slide 39: Cooling Off Period Clarifications**General support for retrospective CoS after cooling-off period**

One participant stated that they did not support this.

General consensus issues between suppliers and NIE

K Cahill asked whether CoS goes out to 13 days if no read comes in between N010 and end of cooling-off period. A Ferguson replied that the CoS dates the reading provided on the N010. S Leane asked whether the audit forms go to MPRN level, and if so that there must be a start

3. Presentation of Fieldwork Proposals and Issues - General Issues

and end date. A Ferguson stated that the reading dates were available. K Cahill added that the first reading date is effectively the CoS date. A participant asked why the CoS becomes effective the day after the reading. A Ferguson responded that CoS readings taken at midday and after are deemed to take effect at midnight next day, but if fieldwork is associated with the CoS, the CoS take place at the start of the day.

Slide 40: CoS Required Date Clarifications**Interval meters – required date mandatory****Non-interval meters – required date optional**

S Leane asked whether a recent IGG had discussed extending the three day reading window in RoI, and added that a response had been sent on foot of it. C Morrison stated that GB may use a five-day window, and the reading is deemed to be the effective CoS date.

Slide 41: Objection and Cancellation

C Morrison asked whether there were any scenarios under which 21 days were insufficient. A Ferguson replied that it would probably be the scheduled read, which happens in RoI, except that the NI read window is longer. C Morrison stated that this did not seem to comply with EU law, and asked whether 21 days is obligatory on the supplier. G Harnett replied that a customer can insist on 21 days. V Gallagher asked whether the code of practice will be discussed in the context of objections. A Ferguson stated that the aim presently is to reach understanding and clarification before discussing the harmonised approach at the next meeting on 11th November.

Slide 42: New Connection**NIE and ESB clarifications – no energisation without accepted registration from supplier**

K Cahill referred to customers registering online over a weekend, and asked whether they will be held until the next working day. A Ferguson replied that requests will be actioned on the next business day. S Leane enquired whether the appointment booking system will be dealt with outside working hours if it goes down, and A Ferguson stated that the booking system is part of a single website, similar to RoI. K Cahill asked whether appointments can be made for a public holiday or weekend, A Ferguson responded that public holidays etc are blanked out.

3. Presentation of Fieldwork Proposals and Issues - General Issues**Slide 43: De-registration Proposals****Incentives differ in RoI and NI due to differences in DUoS charging arrangements**

G Harnett asked about the energy component. A Ferguson replied that there is an incentive arrangement for revenue protection, and that it is possible to collect money from the customer to offset DUoS charges.

NIE does not propose to change current de-registration arrangements, MPRN termination, service removal

NIE proposes – keep current arrangements on DUoS; new arrangement on failure to de-energise; MM 020 not introduced in NI

K Cahill enquired whether a 020MM will be created and not used, or not created. A Ferguson replied that it will exist in the schema. G Harnett asked when DUoS charges will stop on failure to de-energise, and A Ferguson responded that it would be when the transaction is completed.

Slide 44: Miscellaneous Clarifications (1)

MPRN is same format in NI and RoI

Action – report back on algorithm in use

Change of usage

Slide as presented.

Slide 45: Miscellaneous Clarifications (2)

NIE propose retaining data on specific equipment; annual review and monitoring removal; no prioritisation

Slide as presented.

Slide 47: Comments on today's proposal

To be received by Friday 6th November for meeting on 11th November

Slide as presented.

3. Presentation of Fieldwork Proposals and Issues - General Issues**4. AOB**

G Harnett stated that the governance works on an ESB baseline, and worthwhile changes will be referred back to the IGG. M Atkinson responded that this was on the agenda.

5. Update on Harmonisation Project Governance Arrangements

Slide: The Harmonisation Project

Several stages

HSG to ensure at least to end 2nd stage to provide governance through introduction of harmonisation

HWG has key role to end 1st stage, will continue into 2nd stage to resolve specific issues, prepare for market testing

Enduring arrangements for governance of harmonised market determined during next period

Slide as presented.

Slide: Scope of HSG Governance

Scope of initial HP – outside scope

HSG Membership will comprise CER, NIAUR, ESBN and NIE – suppliers represented by ESBN and NIE

However, RAs also to attend HSG meetings to ensure HSG fully appreciates supplier views

G Harnett asked whether an item can be raised on HSG agenda from within the HWG, and M Atkinson replied that issues can be raised in the HWG. K Cahill enquired whether the suppliers can raise pressing issues directly, and M Atkinson replied that this can be done. K

5. Update on Harmonisation Project Governance Arrangements

Cahill stated that RAs seem to be either NI or RoI, and so might not appreciate the issues of suppliers who operate in both markets. M Atkinson indicated that any issue suppliers feel has not been properly addressed can be raised, preferably in the meeting so that it appears on the HSG agenda.

Slide: HSG Key Activities

During HP stage one, by December 2009; HP stage 2, by January 2010 for c. two years.

Slide as presented.

Slide: HSG Issue Resolution During Stage One

Slide as presented.

Slide: Harmonisation Issues Log

Record of all outstanding harmonisation issues that cannot be resolved by 31 December 2009

Slide as presented.

Slide: HP Stage Two – Alignment of Plans

Baseline for the beginning of January

K Cahill stated that Airtricity has to change workflows, business processes and training, so the timeframe may not be the same. M Atkinson replied that the group was prepared to work with suppliers on the cut-off point. H Mounsey added that the timeline for the harmonisation test phase was the best part of two years. M Atkinson said that any later changes to messaging would have a knock-on effect in terms of workflow implications, and that there was a realistic timeframe for working out some of the outstanding issues. M Rowley indicated that the baseline ES design should be frozen, and any changes should be on a must-have basis, as otherwise there will be a far longer period to allow changes to be built in. H Mounsey stated that the baseline to aim at is 80-90% stable by January.

5. Update on Harmonisation Project Governance Arrangements**Slide: Flow of Decisions to HSG****Proposal - contingency meetings to be designated 3A and 4A – participants agreed.**

K Cahill asked whether harmonisation will go live at the end of 2011 as well as ES, and M Atkinson replied that the aspiration is to undertake as much harmonisation work as possible as part of ES. S Leane enquired when the changes to the Rol schema to align with NI will take place. W Keady said that delivery will be timed to coincide with ES delivery. M Rowley added that some of the harmonisation changes might be incorporated earlier than go live for ES. K Cahill pointed out that the NI schema change is much bigger because of new business processes, and that in order to find windows for the changes it is necessary to know when the schema changes are happening. W Keady answered that some will depend on procurement processes, and present work is more to do with facilitating procurement timelines. The issue is what suits the market. M Atkinson indicated that the substantive implementation should align with the common go live date. A participant asked whether there may be a risk that what is implemented in Rol may be different from what is already part of ES. M Rowley explained that there are several ways to implement, and that the harmonised schema has to be frozen well in advance of go live in both jurisdictions, and further changes must be frozen.

G Harnett said that some areas have not been harmonised, where the NI solution is seen as being better, and it would be better to have a solution involving the best of both worlds. M Atkinson responded that if suppliers have a sense that there are benefits in moving closer to NI model, these have to be documented and an action plan agreed for consideration within the governance structure. G Harnett indicated that the NIE position on new connections, deregistration and objections should be harmonised across both markets. W Keady replied that any change process is dealt with as a Discussion Request through the IGG. K Cahill added that the cut-off date would be moved in this case, and that the mapping of messages is different at the moment. J Murphy responded that there is a common message at the end of the process, and fields that were mandatory are becoming optional because of the different systems. G Harnett agreed, but stated that there will be a short window of change in the New Year that will not necessarily follow the IGG timeline. J Murphy replied that the window is to facilitate changes to ensure the schema release is not jeopardised, and changes involving the schema go back to the governance group. G Harnett enquired about the available time window for making changes and W Keady replied that it mainly depends on the outcome of the procurement process in NI.

K Cahill pointed out that debt hopping is not available for Rol, and asked whether making it available in Rol constitutes a schema change. T O'Neill replied that it depends on how this

5. Update on Harmonisation Project Governance Arrangements

change would be implemented, that the concept for harmonisation is that the RoI will have the same message fields as NI, and that if a processes needs to be introduced in RoI the same fields are available to be used. C McEvoy added that this would not be a schema change, that certain codes will be ignored in RoI as part of harmonisation because certain back end processes are different. K Cahill asked whether a CER decision on debt hopping in August would upset the harmonisation process. J Murphy responded that it may or may not impact it, as it depends on the wording of the MCR and the impact and another option would be to raise it at the IGG and to determine the best way to approach the changes in RoI.

M Atkinson stated that the governance arrangement has been established, and detailed processes are already available in RoI to process these requests, but supplier preferences should also be raised formally so they can be dealt with in a joined up way. K Cahill asked whether there should be a review of all change requests at the HWG to ensure this. W Keady replied that the governance arrangements for 2010 are not yet fully formalised with CER.